

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/897,136 | MORITA, TETSUYA |
| | Examiner Mark E. Wallerson | Art Unit 2626 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark E. Wallerson.

(3) James J. Kulbaski.

(2) Andy Harry.

(4) Katsuyori Matsubara.

Date of Interview: 21 September 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Doi (U.S. 5,995,712).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

MARK WALLERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed new independent claims which set forth a first program within the platform of the multifunctional device, configured to receive processing instructions from a plurality of applications and a second program within the platform configured to receive a processing instruction from the plurality of applications, wherein the first and second programs are shared by the plurality of applications. The Examiner does not believe that the cited reference discloses this feature, and would reconsider the claimed subject matter upon receipt of Applicant's official response..